

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 36 were previously pending in the present application, of which claims 1 – 17 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein and to which claims 37 – 60 have been added. It is respectfully submitted, that pending claims define allowable subject matter.

Initially, the undersigned affirms the election made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group II (claims 18 – 36).

Claims 18 – 36 have been rejected under 35 USC section 103 as being unpatentable over Rallison et al (USP 5,903,395) in view of Vancelette (USP 5,894,320). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for reasons set forth hereafter.

Claim 18 recites a wireless handheld device for receiving video content associated with an event. The device of claim 18 includes, among others things, a portable receiver with a handheld housing configured to receive video content transmitted wirelessly to the receiver. The video content originates at a plurality of sources located at the event. The signal processing logic within the handheld housing is configured for selective operation by a user to select video content from at least one of the plurality of sources. The device also includes a display configured to display video content from at least one of the plurality of the sources selected by the user.

It is respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill to combine the teachings of Rallison and Vancelette in any manner that would render obvious the claimed device. In the outstanding Office Action, it is maintained that it would have been obvious to modify Rallison's system by providing different camera angle video and audio feeds for viewing a program as disclosed by Vancelette to allow viewers selectively watching a sporting event with different views. The undersigned strenuously disagrees that it would have

been obvious to modify so significantly Rallison's system as to incorporate the functionality of Vancelette's set top box.

Rallison describes a personal visual display system that is "light weight and compact" and is configured to be mounted on a user's head to provide a head mounted display device. Vancelette describes a home based system that allows a television viewer to control remapping of channel assignments. Vancelette's system includes a set top terminal 70 provided in a subscriber's home which is attached to a data link 58 and controls display of a television 80 (column 7, lines 9-18). The set top terminal 70 is not portable, is not handheld and does not receive video content transmitted wirelessly thereto. Neither Vancelette, nor Rallison teach or suggest any way of incorporating all of the functionality of Vancelette's set top terminal 70 within the head mounted display of Rallison's.

In fact, Rallison's head mounted display offers little or no signal processing capability. Rallison's teachings are primarily directed to the optics by which images are created within the display. To the extent that Rallison discusses signal processing, Rallison expressly teaches that the signal processing and other control functionality should be provided separate and remote from the head mounted display and not portable. Rallison's head mounted display includes a connector 36 that is connected to a cable which provides data transfer for other communication with a video/audio source 38 such as a computer, VCR, video disc player, broadcast television receiver, television cable or fiber optics source, gaming device or video telephone service (column 4, lines 18-23) none of which are portable or handheld. The cable 34 is also used to deliver power to the apparatus. Therefore, by Rallison's express teachings, the head mounted display does not include a portable receiver configured to receive video content transmitted wirelessly to the receiver. Nor does Rallison's head mounted device include signal processing logic, within a handheld housing, configured for selectable operation by a user to select video content from one of the plurality of sources. While Rallison references wireless data communication at column 4, lines 25-28, Rallison still requires the use of a separate video/audio source that is not portable and not handheld, namely a computer, VCR, video disc player, etc.

Rallison only contemplates wireless communication between the head mounted unit and the video/audio source 38 not between the video/audio source 38 and a remote wireless network.

Therefore, even if combined, at best Rallison and Vancelette teach or suggest that a wireless communications link be provided between Rallison's head mounted unit and the set top terminal 70 of Vancelette. Such a combination does not teach or suggest the claimed invention as such a combination would not include a portable receiver that receives video content from plural sources, non-signal processing logic in the handheld unit that allowed the user to select between video content. Claim 18 clearly requires that the wireless handheld device include within the handheld housing both a portable receiver configured to receive video content from a plurality of sources at an event and the signal processing logic for selectable operation by a user to select video content from the plurality of sources. Thus, claim 18 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art.

Dependant claims recite additional features of the wireless handheld device, none of which are taught or suggested the combined teachings of Rallison and Vancelette. Claims 19, 20, 45 and 55 further define the receiver as being configured to receive video content originating at another event (e.g., an entirely different sporting event of similar or different nature, a non-sporting event, and the alike). Vancelette's functionality is in the set top box, while Rallison does not discuss content.

Claims 27-29, 48 and 59 further define the device to allow the user to select images for display by the display. Claim 34 further defines the video content as being from a sideline perspective and spectator perspective. Claim 35 defines the video content to provide different images from the event where images are selected for display by the signal processing logic. The prior art does not teach or suggest the above features to be provided in a portable handheld device.

Claim 36 recites a wireless handheld device for displaying image content that includes a portable receiver within a handheld housing that is configured to receive image content

transmitted wirelessly to the receiver where the image content originates at a plurality of sources at the event. The device also includes signal processing logic and a user interface within the handheld housing for selecting images from at least one of the plural sources. As explained above, a person of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to modify Rallison's system in a manner that would render obvious the claimed invention, based on Vancelette's secondary teachings or any other prior art reference. Both Vancelette and Rallison require a base unit that is not portable and not handheld to perform signal processing and other video content management functions. The additional newly added dependent claims recite non-obvious features as the prior art fails to teach or suggest such features in a portable handheld unit.

The term wireless handheld device encompasses scanners, PDAs, notebook computers, laptop computers, cell phones, and the like. The term image includes photographs, still images, video clips, highlight clips and the like. The term source includes individual and broadcast cameras, digital cameras and the like. In view of forgoing comments respectfully submitted that the pending claims defined allowable subject matter. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dean D. Small, Registration No. 34,370  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070